When Death or Loss Makes Us Laugh: Unraveling the Emotional Paradox and Exploring the Connection Between Grief and Humor

10.6084/m9.figshare.28014581

Andrew Lehti
December 5, 2024

Part of the Collection of:
Cognitive Psychology and the Education System
https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.c.7532079

Learned behaviors and cognitive biases have perpetuated trait inheritance across generations, stemming from an education system established in the fourth century CE, forming a self-sustaining structure resembling a virus causing humans to deny change.

The Semmelweis Reflex is the tendency to reject new evidence because it contradicts established beliefs. Named after Ignaz Semmelweis, who introduced handwashing to reduce infections but was dismissed for challenging medical norms. After being dismissed from his position, he faced opposition and isolation within the medical community, as his handwashing theories were ridiculed and ignored. Eventually, he was committed to a mental asylum, where he reportedly became violent. Soon after his admission, he sustained a severe wound on his hand, potentially from a beating by the staff or another violent encounter, which led to sepsis. This infection caused his death at just 47.

Updated 12/12/2024

To address common concerns about accessibility, it is assured that no paywall will be implemented. This research will remain freely accessible, as research should inherently be open to all.

Methodology

The research focuses on investigating motives, behaviors, and observations while deliberately avoiding prior exposure to academic findings utilizing my approach which is **extrapolative trial by error.** This approach minimizes anchoring biases that could influence the thought process. After completing the study, academic material is reviewed comprehensively to evaluate alignment with the findings. Typically, the findings correspond closely with established principles, with exceptions limited to nuanced insights not yet formally recognized but widely observed in society. Few contradictions arise with established norms, apart from the integration of multiple established biases into more complex, composite biases that reflect broader systemic issues.

Lehti, Andrew (2024). Extrapolative Trial by Error. Journal contribution. https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.27643080

10.6084/m9.figshare.28014581

Introduction

The cognitive impasse is a phenomenon that fosters a self-perpetuating cycle of mental rigidity, ensuring that the frameworks governing thought remain unchanged even as they are adopted by new individuals and institutions. This persistent recycling of identical intellectual structures—wrapped in new contexts and bodies—explains why the educational system has remained fundamentally unaltered for over 1,400 years. Originating from the Roman model of memory discipline and compliance, these paradigms have spread globally, embedding themselves into the fabric of schools, colleges, universities, and academic institutions worldwide.

While the tools, technologies, and methodologies of education have evolved, the underlying framework remains steadfast, prioritizing conformity and the avoidance of error over critical thinking and adaptability. The cognitive impasse not only sustains this system but also prevents those within it from seeing its flaws clearly—particularly if they are unwilling to confront the discomfort of challenging ingrained beliefs. This resistance to change ensures that educational paradigms persist, reinforcing societal stagnation masked as progress.

10.6084/m9.figshare.28014581

Abstract

Why do we laugh in the face of loss? This paradoxical behavior, blending humor with grief, unfolds as an intricate interplay between cognitive biases, dissonance, and psychological defense mechanisms. On the comedic stage, humor leverages expectation and disruption, utilizing cognitive biases to craft setups and introducing dissonance through punchlines. Laughter, in this context, serves as a resolution, transforming contradictions into shared amusement. Similarly, when confronted with grief, the mind experiences a Cognitive Impasse—a cycle of mental defenses escalating as belief clashes with reality. The impasse manifests in stages, beginning with laughter as a temporary shield against overwhelming emotions and progressing through rejection, avoidance, and belief perseverance. This exploration delves into the shared cognitive landscapes of humor and grief, examining how dissonance shapes these experiences and how the resolution of contradiction is vital for psychological equilibrium.

The Cognitive Interplay of Humor and Dissonance

In the theater of the human mind, humor unfolds as an intricate interplay between expectation and reality. Imagine the stage: the setup is constructed with care, drawing on familiar patterns and the comforting predictability of our cognitive biases. These biases act as stagehands, arranging the scenery of our thoughts, shaping how we anticipate the world to behave. They craft assumptions, preparing us for what we believe is to come.

Then, without warning, the punchline enters. It disrupts the order, pulling a curtain to reveal not what we anticipated but something delightfully absurd or cleverly contrary. In this moment, our minds encounter cognitive dissonance—a clash between the script we were following and the unexpected twist. This dissonance might be unsettling in other contexts, but in comedy, it's softened by the playful nature of the imaginary stage, allowing us to process the contradiction as humor rather than confusion or frustration.

Take, for example, a classic joke. The setup establishes an expectation: **"Why did the chicken cross the road?"** Our cognitive biases supply the anticipation—a complex motivation or a clever narrative payoff. Instead, the punchline sidesteps complexity: "To get to the other side." Its simplicity deflates our expectations in a way that invites laughter instead of frustration. The humor lies not just in the twist but in our brain's ability to embrace the contradiction, resolving the dissonance through the release that laughter provides. Comedy thrives with the unexpected.

Sometimes, the narrative is more personal. Consider self-deprecating humor, where an individual shares a flaw or failure with the audience. The joke exposes a dissonance: the contrast between the storyteller's ideal self and the reality of their imperfections. Yet, it reassures us that these contradictions are universal, creating a connection between the one who laughs and the one who shares. Laughter bridges the gap between tension and resolution, discomfort and understanding.

In satire, the stakes are grander. The comedian holds up a mirror to society, highlighting hypocrisies and contradictions we might otherwise avoid. The audience, too, feels the strain of dissonance—recognizing flaws in systems they rely on or beliefs they hold dear. Humor transforms this tension into something digestible, allowing us to confront uncomfortable truths without despair. We laugh, and in doing so, reclaim control over the dissonance, turning it into a tool for reflection rather than discomfort.

Comedy's genius lies in navigating these cognitive landscapes, weaving bias and dissonance into a seamless act. The mind, for all its complexity, delights in the playful dance of contradiction. It finds joy not in perfection but in the gaps, the unexpected turns, the moments when it is tricked yet complicit in the trick. Laughter, then, is more than a reaction—it is a resolution, a reminder that even dissonance and absurdity can harmonize in the shared experience of humor.

Humor often intertwines cognitive bias and cognitive dissonance to create compelling effects. The setup of a joke leverages biases to establish a particular expectation, while the punchline introduces dissonance by deviating from it. Resolving this dissonance through laughter not only amuses but also provides psychological relief. This interplay is evident in various comedic forms, from stand-up routines to sitcoms, where the

audience's recognition of the expectation and appreciation of the twist determine the humor's success. Sometimes, comedy delivers a profound truth long overlooked, throwing a cognitive curveball that magnifies its effect.

Laughter occurs similarly across situations—whether from a joke, moments of anger, insanity, or even profound grief. The same common behaviors of Cognitive Impasse emerge. When someone experiences loss, their mind responds with automatic defenses to shield against overwhelming emotions, encapsulated in the concept of Cognitive Impasse. This begins with immediate, instinctive reactions—manifesting as laughter, which, though seemingly inappropriate, temporarily alleviates discomfort. This laughter isn't rooted in amusement but serves as a delay, allowing the mind to postpone confronting the painful reality.

We often laugh when faced with conflicting beliefs. Beliefs encompass far more than religion or academics; they represent everything we understand about the world. Losing a loved one initiates a Cognitive Impasse, marked by a conflict of belief—specifically, the belief that this person, once ever-present and available for comfort, is no longer there. This clash between reality and belief propels us into the Impasse.

The Cognitive Impasse unfolds in stages, often ending in one of two outcomes: Belief Perseverance, where new information is suppressed, or the integration of this information, reshaping one's understanding of reality. Many experience many stages of the Impasse which include cognitive inertia, where mental processing slows or becomes stuck, clinging to familiar patterns that include the deceased. As discomfort intensifies, the mind escalates defenses, rejecting new information—a behavior known as the Semmelweis Reflex, a rejection of reality to protect fragile mental states.

Avoidant behaviors frequently arise during this cycle, evolving in distinct stages. Initially, individuals distract themselves with tasks to avoid addressing the loss. They might leave the room or invent excuses whenever the deceased is mentioned. At first, avoidance appears as smiles or nervous laughter, but as subconscious rejection deepens, agitation may set in. Some react with mockery or inappropriate comments, which can escalate to anger as the denial persists. This escalation often marks the breaking point, when the reality of the loss can no longer be suppressed. Here, individuals typically experience an emotional collapse, leading to uncontrollable sobbing as they begin to process their grief.

In the extremely rare case where this cannot be processed:

When someone encounters a profound loss or challenging reality, their mind enters a cycle of cognitive impasse, where a series of mental defenses unfold in predictable stages. These stages escalate as the individual struggles to reconcile the conflict between their beliefs and the overwhelming new reality. While most people eventually break down and integrate the truth, rare cases show a refusal to proceed, leading to behaviors that are harmful to the mind.

Stage 1: Manifested Responses

At the onset, the mind reacts with immediate, surface-level defenses. These include physical reactions like laughter, smirking, an eye-roll, or even a scoff—automatic mechanisms to release the tension caused by the dissonance. Laughter at a funeral, for example, is not genuine humor but a coping mechanism to manage the discomfort of facing an undeniable and emotionally taxing truth. This initial response provides a brief emotional shield, delaying deeper engagement with the loss.

Stage 2: Cognitive Inertia

As the dissonance grows, the mind begins to slow down its processing as cognitive biases start to block clear thought. Cognitive inertia is a resistance to engage with the new information altogether. The individual avoids making sense of the contradiction, instead defaulting to existing thought patterns. This stage is characterized by mental stagnation, where even the attempt to process reality feels overwhelming or impossible.

Stage 3: The Semmelweis Reflex

The defensive reaction intensifies into an outright rejection of the new reality, and can be over as quick as someone saying “no,” before breaking down. The Semmelweis Reflex manifests as an automatic dismissal of evidence that contradicts the belief the loved one is still alive. This rejection occurs not out of reason but as a means of preserving the mental framework that feels safer and more familiar. For example, someone may insist that a phone ringing or a voice in the distance confirms their loved one is still present. The brain may even try to reconstruct their voice in background noise in a perfectly sane phenomenon known as **Audio Pareidolia**, where words or music can be perceived through random background noise via our brain’s pattern recognition abilities.

Stage 4: Cognitive Dissonance Avoidance

The growing discomfort may trigger behaviors aimed at entirely avoiding the source of the conflict. At this stage, individuals begin to evade any reminders of the loss or reality itself. This can manifest as avoidance of discussions, physical withdrawal from reminders of the deceased, or even fabricated distractions to prevent direct engagement with the truth. Physiological symptoms—nausea, fatigue, or restlessness—might also surface as the body reacts to the unresolved dissonance. **It can even cause coherent sentences to become incoherent drivel.**

Stage 5: Projected Biases

As the individual continues resisting the confrontation of reality, they may start to project their conflict onto others. They may accuse people of being insensitive or dismissive when the topic of their loved one is broached. This externalizes their internal turmoil, allowing them to redirect the discomfort outward and avoid reflecting on their own refusal to engage with the truth. This section can be very complex and will be discussed later in detail.

Stage 6: Cognitive Dissonance

Here, the person experiences the dissonance directly, often in its most intense form. They begin to feel the full weight of the contradiction between their false belief and reality. This feeling of overwhelming guilt, anguish, and impending doom paired with physical manifestations like gut-wrenching pain and headaches occur when we fight against reality. The mind becomes trapped in a cycle of resistance and discomfort, oscillating between attempts to preserve the false belief and fleeting moments of awareness of the truth.

Stage 7: Cognitive Bias Reinforcement

To shield themselves further, individuals may unconsciously reinforce their false beliefs through selective reasoning and distorted interpretations of evidence. Cognitive biases—like confirmation bias—help them justify their stance, dismissing any challenges to their worldview. They may fabricate scenarios or selectively recall memories that align with their need to believe their loved one is still alive. This is the final stage to belief perseverance where the brain may employ over two hundred cognitive biases to reject reality.

Stage 8: Belief Perseverance

At this final stage, the person becomes fully entrenched in their false belief, despite overwhelming evidence to the contrary. The denial becomes a self-sustaining mental framework, and any attempt to challenge it triggers responses such as deranged laughter or deflection. While most people eventually break down and allow the cognitive impasse to proceed into reality, in very rare cases, this stage can escalate into behaviors that resemble insanity.

Most eventually allow the Cognitive Impasse to dissolve, confronting reality—a painful yet crucial step toward healing. In **extremely rare** cases, individuals may resist entirely, refusing to accept a loved one's death. This refusal anchors them in a false reality, preserving the belief that the person is still alive. At this point, the mind's defenses, initially protective, likely become harmful. Recognizing and addressing this dissonance, though difficult, is essential for moving forward.

Reconciling Dissonance: The Role of Laughter in Healing

Laughter, whether triggered by humor or grief, reveals the mind's nuanced response to cognitive dissonance. In comedy, it resolves the tension between expectation and reality, fostering shared moments of joy. In grief, it serves as an initial defense against the discomfort of loss, offering a temporary reprieve that delays emotional processing. While most individuals resolve cognitive impasses by integrating painful truths, exceptional cases demonstrate the mind's capacity to resist resolution, leading to potential harm. Understanding the common mechanisms underlying humor and grief enhances appreciation of the mind's resilience and vulnerability, underscoring the importance of embracing dissonance as a critical step toward healing and connection.

Rare Cases and Harmful Behaviors

Rare cases where cognitive impasses result in harmful behaviors highlight the mind’s extreme resistance to reconciling dissonance. Such scenarios often involve persistent denial or delusion, leading to actions that strain social relationships, mental health, or physical well-being. For example, an individual refusing to accept the death of a loved one may create elaborate scenarios to sustain the belief that the person is still alive. This might manifest as hoarding belongings, engaging in rituals to "maintain contact," or isolating themselves from those who challenge their narrative.

Interventions for such cases require a multi-faceted approach. **Cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT)** can help by gradually exposing individuals to the reality of their loss, while mindfulness practices aid in processing unresolved emotions. In extreme instances, **psychiatric evaluation** may be necessary to address underlying conditions, such as psychosis or severe depression, that perpetuate the impasse. **Community support groups** for grief and loss provide safe spaces for individuals to share experiences and begin healing. By acknowledging and addressing the rare but profound consequences of unresolved cognitive dissonance, psychological professionals can guide individuals toward acceptance and recovery.

Implications for Therapeutic Practices and Society

Understanding the shared cognitive mechanisms of humor and grief offers profound implications for therapeutic practices, societal norms, and educational systems. In therapy, this understanding can guide the development of techniques that incorporate humor as a tool for emotional regulation. For example, therapists might use humor to ease tension during difficult discussions, helping clients process grief with reduced emotional overwhelm. Humor-based interventions could encourage individuals to reframe painful memories, fostering resilience and hope.

On a societal level, promoting awareness of the cognitive overlap between humor and grief can help normalize laughter in the context of loss, reducing the stigma around seemingly inappropriate emotional responses. Educational programs could integrate this knowledge into **emotional intelligence curricula**, teaching students to navigate complex emotions effectively. For example, lessons on cognitive dissonance and emotional processing could provide young individuals with tools to handle grief and humor as natural coping mechanisms.

A Call to Action

A broader call to action is essential: society must embrace humor and grief as natural responses to cognitive dissonance. By fostering environments that encourage open dialogue about loss and the role of humor in healing, communities can cultivate greater empathy and connection. This shift supports individual well-being while strengthening collective resilience, transforming discomfort into opportunities for growth and understanding. Recognizing humor and grief as complementary pathways to resolution allows individuals to navigate dissonance with compassion, adaptability, and a deeper sense of shared humanity.

Further Reading

Lehti, Andrew (2024). **Cognitive Impasse and the Puppet Master of Society**: A Framework of Mental Rigidity. figshare. Journal contribution. https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.28014626

Lehti, Andrew (2024). **The Cycle of Inferiority and Superiority**: From Imposition to Projection and Self-Perpetuation. figshare. Journal contribution. https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.28013819

Lehti, Andrew (2024). **The Canonical Order of Operations**: a Separate Index Law Framework. figshare. Journal contribution. https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.27661734

Lehti, Andrew (2024). The Essence of Intelligence: **Redefining Intelligence Beyond Rote Memorization**. figshare. . https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.28014671

References:

Samson, Andrea C.; Gross, James J. (2014): The Dark and Light Sides of Humor: An Emotion-Regulation Perspective. Oxford University Press. (BookChapter).
https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199926725.003.0010

Altan-Atalay, A.; Boluvat, M. Fatih (2024): Cognitive Flexibility and Depression: The Moderator Roles of Humor Styles. Springer. (JournalArticle).
https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-024-05931-8

Lehti, Andrew (2024). Cognitive Impasse: The Self-Perpetuating Cycle of Learned Behaviors and Cognitive Biases. figshare. Journal contribution.
https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.27367785.v2

Lehti, Andrew (2024). Selective-Mindedness: An Introduction and the Illusion of Open-Mindedness. figshare. Journal contribution.
https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.27642519.v1